

Remarks

Claims 21-40 are pending in this application. Claims 21, 25, 27, 31, 33, 37, and 39 are amended solely in an effort to expedite prosecution. No claims are canceled or added. No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to the Applicants' representatives during the personal interview conducted on June 16, 2005. The amendments to the claims and the remarks included in this paper are believed to reflect the understanding between the Examiner and the Applicants representatives that was reached in the personal interview.

In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

Rejection Under Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 21-40 are rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-20 and 1-18 of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,064,977 and 6,301,621, respectively. Applicants will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome this rejection after the claims have been determined to otherwise be in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Higley, US Patent No. 5,790,793 (herein referred to as Higley) in view of Sankar, US Patent No. 5,867,822 (herein referred to as Sankar). Applicant traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claim 21 includes, among other things, the recitation of a user interface that displays a plurality of object representations that correspond to the plurality of non-markup language objects, wherein the server enables selection of one

or more of the plurality of object representations, and translates one or more non-markup language objects that correspond to the selected one or more object representations, the one or more non-markup language objects being translated to at least one markup language object. Independent claims 27, 33, and 39 include similar features, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, representations of non-HTML objects may be embedded in an HTML document, and a user may select a desired non-HTML object by selecting a corresponding representation of the desired non-HTML object (see the Specification at page 30, lines 14-17). The user's selection may be relayed to a non-HTML server (see the Specification at page 31, lines 6-10). The non-HTML server may retrieve the desired non-HTML object, which may then be translated by an HTML translator (see the Specification at page 31, lines 11-13).

Higley appears to be drawn to a system that receives email messages in either URL, HTML, or text format. See Higley at the Abstract. If a received email message arrives in a URL format, the message is essentially a pointer to another address on the internet, and the URL contained in the message may be automatically looked up. However, neither the received message, nor the object (or objects) located at the URL are translated. See Higley at col. 5, lines 27-41. If a received email message arrives in an HTML format, the message is simply displayed, which may enable a user to select a URL hyper-link contained therein to access an object (or objects) located at the URL. But Higley does not disclose translating the HTML message, or the object (or objects) located at the URL. See Higley at col. 5, lines 42-53. Finally, if a received email message is in a text format, the email message is automatically translated to HTML.

See Higley at col. 5, lines 54-63. This may convert any URL addresses in the text email message into hyper-links that may be selected by a user to access an object (or objects) located at the URL. See Higley at col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 8. If the user selects a hyper-link, Higley does not disclose translating the object or objects located at the selected URL.

In other words, Higley apparently discloses a system that automatically translates emails upon receipt, if they arrive in a text format. However, Higley does not teach or suggest a user interface that displays a plurality of object representations that correspond to the plurality of non-markup language objects, wherein the server enables selection of one or more of the plurality of object representations, and translates one or more non-markup language objects that correspond to the selected one or more object representations, the one or more non-markup language objects being translated to at least one markup language object.

Furthermore, the Examiner admits that Higley is deficient at least for failing to teach a non-markup language object comprising scheduling and calendaring information. The Examiner relies on Sankar for a teaching of scheduling and calendaring information in an enterprise system. Sankar appears to be drawn to an electronic calendar that uses allegedly new protocols and mechanisms (see Sankar at the Abstract). Even if the Examiner's allegation with respect to the teachings of Sankar is true, Sankar is silent regarding the deficiency of Higley addressed above.

Thus, Higley and Sankar, both alone and in combination, fail to teach all of the features of the claimed invention. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 21, 27, 33, and 39 should be withdrawn. Claims 22-26, 28-32, 34-

38, and 40 depend from corresponding ones of independent claims 21, 27, 33, and 39, and, therefore, are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sean L. Ingram', is written over a horizontal line.

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000